

1 HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

10
11 IN RE WASHINGTON MUTUAL
MORTGAGE BACKED SECURITIES
12 LITIGATION

13 This Document Relates to: ALL CASES

14 Master Case No. 2:09-cv-00037-MJP

15 **PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SEAL
CERTAIN PORTIONS OF EXHIBIT H
TO THE DECLARATION OF JEE
YOUNG YOU IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS
CERTIFICATION**

16
17 **NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
July 29, 2011**

18
19 **I. INTRODUCTION**

20 Lead Plaintiffs Doral Bank Puerto Rico (“Doral Bank”) and Policemen’s Annuity and
21 Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago (“Chicago PABF”) and Plaintiff Boilermakers National
22 Annuity Trust (“Boilermakers”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) file this Motion to Seal certain
23 portions of excerpts from the Deposition of Marangal Domingo (“Domingo”) which has been
24 submitted as Exhibit H to the Declaration of Jee Young You in Support of Defendants’
25 Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification. (Dkt. No. 250). Plaintiffs
26 respectfully request that the Court issue an Order sealing marked excerpts of Exhibit H and
27 allow the public filing of the proposed redacted version of Exhibit H, which is attached as

1 Exhibit A to the Declaration of Enrique Ubarri. (“Ubarri Declaration”). The proposed
 2 redactions contain proprietary information that is subject to protection under the Stipulated
 3 Protective Order the Court entered in this case (Dkt. No. 213) (the “Protective Order”) and
 4 concerns ongoing business of Doral Bank, the disclosure of which could result in the
 5 annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense to Doral Bank.

6 II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

7 On March 11, 2011, Plaintiffs submitted their motion seeking to certify a class of
 8 purchasers of certain WaMu mortgage-backed securities. On June 22, 2011, in connection
 9 with the filing of their opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion, Defendants moved to seal portions of
 10 their memorandum of points and authorities in support of their opposition to plaintiffs’
 11 motion for class certification, the expert report of Professor Christopher M. James and certain
 12 exhibits in support of their opposition. Among the exhibits that Defendants sought to file
 13 under seal were certain excerpts from the deposition of Marangal Domingo, a Rule 30(b)(6)
 14 witness testifying on behalf of Plaintiff Doral Bank. The excerpts (“Exhibit H”) included
 15 confidential information concerning Doral Bank’s business practices and investment
 16 procedures. See Ex. H at 88-89, 190-91, 218-19, 224. Pursuant to the Protective Order, and
 17 as made evident by the notation on the top of each page of Exhibit H, the Domingo
 18 deposition transcript was marked confidential by Plaintiffs. Defendants appropriately, in
 19 Plaintiffs’ view, filed such excerpts under seal. However, in support of their motion to seal
 20 Defendants did not fully explain the reasons sealing Exhibit H was appropriate. Defendants
 21 argued only that that the exhibits sought to be filed under seal, including Exhibit H, were
 22 protected from disclosure by federal law, including the Graham-Leach-Bliley Act, 15 U.S.C.
 23 § 6801, et seq. However, on July 8, 2011, this Court ruled that Defendants had failed to
 24 rebut the presumption favoring access to judicial documents and had not shown how the
 25 Graham-Leach-Bliley Act applied to protect Exhibit H from disclosure. *In re Washington*
 26 *Mutual Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation*, Civ. No. 09-0037-MJP, Dkt. No. 266
 27

1 (W.D.Wa July 8, 2011) (the “Order”). As a result, the Court ordered that the exhibits be
 2 publicly filed.

3 Plaintiffs bring this motion to maintain certain portions of Exhibit H under seal, not
 4 because they are protected by the Graham-Leach-Bliley Act, but because they contain
 5 confidential personal information and trade secrets about Doral Bank and its employees, and
 6 there are compelling reasons to keep that information sealed.

7 III. ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITY

8 A. Standard of Review

9 The Court has authority to seal documents, or portions of documents, that contain
 10 confidential or highly sensitive information. The Protective Order and LR 5(g)(3) provide
 11 that a party must obtain the Court’s authority to seal documents by filing a motion to seal.
 12 This Court has previously ruled that it will not grant a motion to seal made in connection
 13 with a motion for class certification absent compelling reasons. See Order Granting in Part
 14 and Denying in Part Motion to Seal, *Kelley v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. cv-00475-MJP, Dkt. 129.

15 A “compelling reasons” standard applies to the sealing of most judicial records.
 16 *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Assoc.*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (2010) (citing *Kamakana v. City &*
 17 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins.*
 18 *Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135-36 (9th Cir. 2003)). This standard derives from the common law
 19 right “to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and
 20 documents.” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178 (citation and internal quotation marks
 21 omitted)). To limit this common law right of access, a party seeking to seal judicial records
 22 must show that “compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings ... outweigh the
 23 general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Id.* (citing *Kamakana*,
 24 447 F.3d at 1178-79 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)).

25 Under the “compelling reasons” standard, a district court must weigh “relevant
 26 factors,” base its decision “on a compelling reason,” and “articulate the factual basis for its
 27 ruling, without relying on hypothesis or conjecture.” *Id.* at 679 (quoting *Hagestad v.*

1 *Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)). Courts in the Ninth Circuit have considered
 2 the following factors in determining whether compelling reasons exist to warrant sealing
 3 records: (1) the public’s interest in understanding the judicial process; (2) whether disclosure
 4 of the material at issue could result in improper use (such as to incite scandal, libel a party, or
 5 enable infringement of a party’s trade secrets); (3) the interests of the parties, and the balance
 6 of equities; and (4) the duty of the court to balance all of these competing interests and to
 7 inform the public of the basis for its decision. See *California ex rel. Lockyer v. Safeway, Inc.*,
 8 355 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1115 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Comm’n, Inc.*,
 9 435 U.S. 589, 602-04, 98 S. Ct. 1306, 55 L. Ed. 2d 570 (1978); *Hagestad*, 49 F.3d at 1434;
 10 *Valley Broad. Co. v. U.S. District Court*, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1986)) (finding in the
 11 context of a labor dispute that consideration of these factors as well as “the national labor
 12 policy” were relevant in evaluating a non-party’s motion to seal exhibits containing personal
 13 financial information).

14 **B. Compelling Reasons Exist to Redact Portions of Exhibit H**

15 “It is well-settled that the court has the authority to shield proprietary information
 16 related to the ongoing operations of a business from public review. *Selling Source, LLC v.*
 17 *Red River Ventures, LLC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49664 (D. Nev. Apr. 29, 2011). In *Selling*
 18 *Source*, faced with a motion to seal discovery documents and deposition transcripts that
 19 related to the Defendant’s business, the court held that, “most of the material consists of
 20 detailed information regarding the parties’ business operations, customer agreements,
 21 corporate structure, the details of Selling Source’s customer base and how the company
 22 works with and licenses products to its customers and measures it takes to protect its
 23 intellectual property. Based on the content of this material, the parties’ interest in protecting
 24 their trade secrets and proprietary business practices outweighs the general public interest in
 25 public filings.” *Selling Source*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49664 at *5.

26 The proposed redactions of confidential information discussed in Exhibit H include
 27 testimony about Doral Bank’s business practices, which constitutes proprietary information

1 that should be shielded from disclosure. This proprietary information includes Doral Bank's
 2 securitizations and investment pricing practices, asset and liability management committee
 3 processes, due diligence practices, and approval procedures. See Ex. H at 88-89, 190-91,
 4 218-19, 224. Public disclosure of this information could further subject Doral Bank to the
 5 risk that this information will be used improperly by third-party competitors.

6 **C. Sealing These Documents Will Not Hamper the Public's Understanding of the
 7 Judicial Process**

8 Moreover, other "relevant factors" warrant sealing this information. First, sealing the
 9 non-public business practices of Doral Bank will neither hamper nor threaten the public's
 10 interest in understanding the judicial process. Indeed, the other exhibits filed in this action,
 11 especially the other exhibits filed in support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion
 12 for Class Certification provide a wealth of information regarding the issues in this case and
 13 Defendants' arguments against class certification. The sealing of discrete portions of one of
 14 the many exhibits submitted in support of Defendants' opposition does not negatively impact
 15 the public's interest.

16 Continued access to the other exhibits filed in this case, including the rest of
 17 Defendants' exhibits, will ensure that the public is able to review and assess the information
 18 most relevant to this case. The public's interest in understanding the claims and defenses in
 19 this case and, ultimately, the public's interest in understanding the judicial process by which
 20 those claims and defenses will be evaluated, will not be impaired if the Court grants this
 motion.

21 **D. Disclosure of This Information Could Result in Improper Use**

22 Furthermore, information regarding Doral Bank's business practices and procedures
 23 could be used against Doral Bank by competitors, the potential of which should be
 24 considered in determining whether compelling reasons exist to seal documents. By bringing
 25 this motion, Plaintiffs seek to prevent the possibility of other entities misusing, manipulating,
 26 or otherwise exploiting this information to the detriment of Doral Bank.
 27

1 **E. Neither the Parties' Interests nor a Balancing of the Equities Precludes Sealing
2 This Information, and The Court Must Balance These Competing Interests and
3 Inform the Public of the Basis for its Decision**

4 Finally, Plaintiffs' interest in protecting this information outweighs those interests of
5 the public. The information Plaintiffs seek to seal has little probative value as to the issues
6 raised in their certification motion or in Defendants' opposition, and sealing this information
7 will not impede the public's ability to independently assess the case. As previously
8 discussed, continued access to other exhibits filed in this matter, especially with regard to
9 Defendants' opposition, will ensure this interest is adequately protected.

10 **IV. CONCLUSION**

11 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court seal excerpts
12 on pages 88-89, 190-91, 218-19 and 224 of Exhibit H to the Declaration of Jee Young You in
13 Support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. A proposed
14 redacted version of Exhibit H is attached to the Ubarri Declaration submitted herewith.

15 **V. PROPOSED ORDER**

16 A proposed order is submitted herewith.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
Dated: July 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

TOUSLEY BRAIN STEPHENS PLLC

By: /s/ Janissa A. Strabuk

Kim D. Stephens, WSBA #11984
Janissa A. Strabuk, WSBA #21827
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 682-5600
Facsimile: (206) 682-2992
Email: kstephens@tousley.com
jstrabuk@tousley.com

Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC

Steven J. Toll
Julie Goldsmith Reiser
Joshua S. Devore (admitted pro hac vice)
Matthew B. Kaplan (admitted pro hac vice)
S. Douglas Bunch (admitted pro hac vice)
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 408-4600
Facsimile: (202) 408-4699
Email: stoll@cohenmilstein.com
jreiser@cohenmilstein.com
jdevore@cohenmilstein.com
mkaplan@cohenmilstein.com
dbunch@cohenmilstein.com

Joel P. Laitman (admitted pro hac vice)
Christopher Lometti (admitted pro hac vice)
Daniel B. Rehns (admitted pro hac vice)
150 East 52nd Street, Thirtieth Floor
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 838-7797
Facsimile: (212) 838-7745
Email: jlaitman@cohenmilstein.com
clometti@cohenmilstein.com
drehtns@cohenmilstein.com

Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class

SCOTT+SCOTT LLP

Arthur L. Shingler III (admitted pro hac vice)
Hal D. Cunningham (admitted pro hac vice)
600 B Street, Suite 1500
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 233-4565
Facsimile: (619) 233-0508
Email: ashingler@scott-scott.com
hcunningham@scott-scott.com

Joseph P. Guglielmo (admitted pro hac vice)
500 Fifth Avenue, 40th Floor
New York, New York 10110
Telephone: (212) 223-6444
Facsimile: (212) 223-6334
Email: jguglielmo@scott-scott.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 15, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send electronic notification of such filing to all counsel of record and additional persons listed below:

Steve W. Berman (Terminated) steve@hbsslaw.com, heatherw@hbsslaw.com,
robert@hbsslaw.com

Larry Steven Gangnes gangnesl@lanepowell.com, docketing-sea@lanepowell.com,
donnellyjossom@lanepowell.com, sebringl@lanepowell.com

David Daniel Hoff dhoff@tousley.com, efile@tousley.com

Stellman Keehnle stellman.keehnle@dlapiper.com, patsy.howson@dlapiper.com

Paul Joseph Kundtz pkundtz@riddellwilliams.com, mbergquam@riddellwilliams.com,
mdowns@riddellwilliams.com

Bruce Earl Larson blarson@karrtuttle.com, psteinfeld@karrtuttle.com

John D Lowery jlowery@riddellwilliams.com, dhammonds@riddellwilliams.com

Louis David Peterson ldp@hcmp.com, smp@hcmp.com

Stephen M. Rummage steverummage@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com

Kim D Stephens kstephens@tousley.com, cbonifaci@tousley.com, wcruz@tousley.com

Robert D Stewart stewart@kiplinglawgroup.com, cannon@kiplinglawgroup.com

Dennis H Walters dwalters@karrtuttle.com, wbarker@karrtuttle.com

Mike Liles, Jr mliles@karrtuttle.com

Steven P Caplow stevencaplow@dwt.com, chrisevo@dwt.com,
jasonSchattenkerk@dwt.com, patrickwatts@dwt.com, sheilarowden@dwt.com

Janissa Ann Strabuk jstrabuk@tousley.com, wcruz@tousley.com

Walter Eugene Barton gbarton@karrtuttle.com, danderson@karrtuttle.com,
nrandall@karrtuttle.com

Gavin Williams Skok gskok@riddellwilliams.com, dhammonds@riddellwilliams.com

1 David M Balabanian david.balabanian@bingham.com
2 Douglas C McDermott doug@mcdermottnewman.com, eric@mcdermottnewman.com
3 Steven J Toll stoll@cohenmilstein.com, efilings@cohenmilstein.com
4 John D Pernick john.pernick@bingham.com
5 Brian C Free bcf@hcmp.com, gcp@hcmp.com
6 Rogelio Omar Riojas omar.riojas@dlapiper.com, karen.hansen@dlapiper.com,
7 nina.marie@dlapiper.com
8 Timothy Michael Moran moran@kiplinglawgroup.com, cannon@kiplinglawgroup.com
9 Arthur L Shingler ashingler@scott-scott.com, efile@scott-scott.com
10 Richard A Speirs rspeirs@cohenmilstein.com
11 Bradley T. Meissner bradley.meissner@dlapiper.com
12 Mary Kay Vyskocil mvyskocil@stblaw.com
13 Barry Robert Ostrager bostrager@stblaw.com, managingclerk@stblaw.com
14 Richard F Hans richard.hans@dlapiper.com, dorinda.castro@dlapiper.com
15 Kerry F Cunningham kerry.cunningham@dlapiper.com
16 Corey E Delaney corey.delaney@dlapiper.com, kerry.cunningham@dlapiper.com,
17 patrick.smith@dlapiper.com, richard.hans@dlapiper.com
18 S Douglas Bunch dbunch@cohenmilstein.com
19 Darren J Robbins e_file_sd@csgrr.com
20 Jonathan Gardner jgardner@labaton.com
21 Hollis Lee Salzman (Terminated) hsalzman@labaton.com,
22 ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com
23 Daniel B Rehns drehns@cohenmilstein.com, efilings@cohenmilstein.com
24 Joel P Laitman jlaitman@cohenmilstein.com
25 Christopher E Lometti clometti@cohenmilstein.com
26
27

1 Michael H. Barr mbarr@sonnenschein.com
2 Kenneth J Pfaehler kenneth.pfaehler@snrdenton.com, nicole.reeber@snrdenton.com
3 Leslie D Davis ldavis@sonnenschein.com
4 Kevin P Chavous kchavous@sonnenschein.com
5 Joseph A. Fonti (Terminated) jfonti@labaton.com, ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com
6 Paul Scarlato pscarlato@labaton.com, ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com
7 Serena Richardson (Terminated) srichardson@labaton.com,
ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com
9 Frank Busch frank.busch@bingham.com, frank.downing@bingham.com,
10 theo.robins@bingham.com
11 Hal D Cunningham hcunningham@scott-scott.com, efile@scott-scott.com,
halcunningham@gmail.com
12 Julie Hwang (Terminated) jhwang@labaton.com, ElectronicCaseFiling@labaton.com
13 Joseph P Guglielmo jguglielmo@scott-scott.com, efile@scott-scott.com
15 Kenneth M Rehns krehns@cohenmilstein.com
16 Adam Zurofsky azurofsky@cahill.com
17 Tammy Roy troy@cahill.com
18 Floyd Abrams fabrams@cahill.com
19 James J. Coster jcoster@ssbb.com, jregan@ssbb.com, managingclerk@ssbb.com
20 Joshua M. Rubins jrubins@ssbb.com, jregan@ssbb.com, managingclerk@ssbb.com
22 Brian O. O'Mara bomara@csgrr.com
23 Joshua S. Devore jdevore@cohenmilstein.com, efilings@cohenmilstein.com
24 Matthew B. Kaplan mkaplan@cohenmilstein.com, efilings@cohenmilstein.com
25 Julie Goldsmith Reiser jreiser@cohenmilstein.com
26 **2:09-cv-00037-MJP Notice will not be electronically mailed to:**
27

1 WaMu Officer Defendants Securities MDL

2 **2:09-cv-00134-MJP Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

3 Bruce Earl Larson dwalters@karrtuttle.com

4 Naumon A Amjad namjed@btkmc.com, knguyen@btkmc.com

5 John A. Kehoe jkehoe@btkmc.com

6 Sharan Nirmul snirmul@btkmc.com

7 Andrew B Brettler (Terminated) abrettler@gmail.com

8 **2:09-cv-00134-MJP Notice will not be electronically mailed to:**

9 WaMu Officer Defendants Securities MDL

10 **2:09-cv-00137-MJP Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

11 Christopher M Huck huck@pypfirm.com, dana@pypfirm.com

12 **2:09-cv-00137-MJP Notice will not be electronically mailed to:**

13 WaMu Officer Defendants Securities MDL

14 **2:09-cv-01557-MJP Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

15 Gavin Williams Skok azurofsky@cahill.com, fabrams@cahill.com, troy@cahill.com

16 **2:09-cv-01557-MJP Notice will not be electronically mailed to:**

17 **2:10-cv-00990-JCC Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

18 Joel E. Wright jw@leesmart.com, sm@leesmart.com

19 John M Casey jcasey@curranfirm.com, kchurch@curranfirm.com

20 Marc Rosenberg mr@leesmart.com, Lawyermarc@comcast.net

21 Michael T. Pines info@pinesandassociates.com, michaelpines@gmail.com

By: /s/ Janissa A. Strabuk
Kim D. Stephens, WSBA #11984
Janissa A. Strabuk, WSBA #21827
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 682-5600
Facsimile: (206) 682-2992
Email: kstephens@tousley.com
jstrabuk@tousley.com

Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class